

Reform, however, does not mean change for the sake of change. Reform means change for the sake of improvement.

Improvement in our welfare system is best accomplished by rewarding work—by making work a prize rather than a penalty.

Work is a prize when a full-time worker can earn enough to pay for life's necessities. Work is a penalty when a person cannot earn enough to pay for food, shelter, clothing, transportation, medical care, and other basic needs.

That is why any discussion of welfare reform must also include a discussion of minimum wage reform.

Under the Contract With America, work would be a penalty rather than a prize.

The work slots proposed to be created by the Personal Responsibility Act would pay \$2.42 an hour for a mother in a family of three.

That hourly wage is almost \$2.00 below the current minimum wage of \$4.25. In Mississippi, pay under the Contract With America would equal just seventy-nine cents per hour.

That is a penalty. That is not a prize.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority of those who will be forced to work at below minimum wage earnings are women.

It is also noteworthy that 6 out of 10 of all minimum wage workers are women.

And, contrary to a popular misconception, most minimum wage earners are adults, not young people.

In addition, many of the minimum wage workers are from rural communities. In fact, it is twice as likely that a minimum wage worker will be from a rural community than from an urban community.

Most disturbingly, far too many minimum wage workers have families, spouses, and children who depend on them.

That is disturbing, Mr. Speaker, because a full-time worker, heading a family of three—the typical size of an American family today—and earning a minimum wage, would fall below the poverty line by close to \$2,500 dollars.

In this country, a person can work, every day, full-time, and still be below the poverty level. Work, in that situation, is a penalty.

A review of the history of the minimum wage is revealing. First implemented in 1938, with passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the minimum wage covers 90 percent of all workers.

Between 1950 and 1981, the minimum wage was raised 12 times. During the 1980's, however, while prices were rising by almost 50 percent, Congress did not raise the minimum wage.

I spoke yesterday, Mr. Speaker, of the impact of a frozen minimum wage during the decade of the 1980's when income dropped and costs escalated.

While the minimum wage stood at \$3.34 an hour, the average cost of a do-

mestic automobile increased from less than \$9,000 to more than \$16,000.

The average cost of local transit went from thirty cents to seventy cents.

While the poor got poorer and the minimum wage stood stagnant, the average per capita cost of health care more than doubled, from \$1,064 per person annually to \$2,601.

From 1980 to 1990, the average cost of a half gallon of milk went from ninety-six cents to a dollar and thirty-nine cents.

The average retail cost of bread went from forty-six cents to seventy cents during this period.

And, a dozen of eggs, which cost 85 cents in 1980, cost more than \$1 by 1990.

In short, Mr. Speaker, while the bottom 20 percent of America lost income and got poorer, the minimum wage was frozen, and cost climbed.

Low income workers are yet to recover from that period. They are still far behind the cost of living and further behind high income workers.

Most importantly, raising wages does not mean losing jobs. Recent, comprehensive study dramatically demonstrates this conclusion.

In my State of North Carolina, for example, a survey of employment practices after the 1991 minimum wage increase is instructive.

That survey found that there was no significant drop in employment and no measurable increase in food prices.

Indeed, the survey found, workers' wages actually increased by more than the required change. The State of Mississippi was also the subject of that study.

When a person works, he or she feels good about themselves. The contribute to their communities, and they are in a position to help their families. Work gives a person an identity.

Our policies, therefore, should encourage people to work. We discourage them from working when we force them to work at wages that leave them in poverty.

When Congress has the opportunity to raise the minimum wage, let's make rewarding work and wage reform an essential part of welfare reform.

Let's encourage people to work. And, let us insure that they can work at a livable wage.

Mr. Speaker, we support a minimum wage that affords every American a livable wage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CLYBURN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio

[Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

REVIEW OF LEGISLATION ALREADY PASSED IN THE 104TH CONGRESS

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I have asked some of my good friends in the House to join me in a special order where what we are going to do is review some of the legislation that has already been passed in the 104th Congress, and then we are going to continue to talk about some of the things that have not been passed yet but that we are working on. It is all part of the program that we call our Contract With America.

I have asked the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRANT] to join me in this, and what I wanted to do first is I have got a nice chart here that is courtesy of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], and I want to use this red pen to talk about some of the things that we have done already.

What we have done is on the very first day of Congress we had promised that a Republican House would, first of all, require Congress to live under the same laws as every other American. We have done that.

We also said that we are going to cut one out of every three congressional committee staffs. We have done that.

And we said that we would cut the congressional budget. We did that as well.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we promised the American people that we are going to pass a balanced budget amendment and a line-item veto, and we said that we would give relief to our States, counties and local cities on unfunded mandates, and we have done that as well.

Now I think one of the things that I want to point out this evening about everything that we have done is because there is so much partisanship that happens on this floor that we see every single day, one would think that there was an open battle going on between the minority and the majority, the Democrats and the Republicans, on a daily basis. Let us review the bidding for just a moment because I think that maybe, Mr. Speaker, you will find these numbers rather surprising:

First of all, the Congressional Accountability Act requiring that every single law of the land also require, be applied, to Congress. Two hundred Democrats joined every single Republican in voting for that.

□ 2120

It was completely unanimous. When it came to the unfunded mandates bill that we passed last Thursday, 130 Democrats joined us to pass that bill. The line-item veto, 71 Democrats joined us. The balanced budget amendment, 72 Democrats joined us. We passed just yesterday and today, three

important crime bills that Mr. BRYANT is going to tell us about, habeas corpus reform, the exclusionary rule reform, and Victims' Restitution Act. We had 71, 71, and 133 Members of the minority join us in that.

What does that prove? Clearly, it proves that this is a bipartisan effort. If you say to yourself as you listen to this, you say, "If that many Democrats were voting for them, why on Earth did you not bring these things to the floor and pass them previously. What is going on?"

Well, what it does show you is two things: First, there is absolutely bipartisan support, in some cases overwhelming bipartisan support, for all of these bills. The other thing it tells you is that some of these bills were never allowed to come to the floor of Congress because the previous leadership refused to allow them to see the light of day to ever get a vote.

We made the pledges that we would bring these things to the floor. We made pledges that we would have votes on them. And we have in fact passed them all. I am not saying we are going to pass everything that comes up under the Contract With America, but we are going to try to.

It has proven to be a remarkable road map for Republicans and for this Congress to stay very focused on the agenda that America wants. And it has also proven, I think, very importantly to be a way for us to reestablish confidence of the American people in what we are doing as a Congress, and their confidence in their ability to elect officials that will actually deliver what they promise.

One of the ways that you can see that is that in the Washington Post survey or poll that was taken last week, we find that confidence in the Congress has doubled, doubled, just since January 4 when we were sworn in. And that is the first time in the 15 years that that particular polling question, how do you feel about Congress, favorable, unfavorable, that has doubled, it is the first time it has ever happened since they have been doing that kind of polling.

Luckily, we have with us two freshmen Members, Mr. BRYANT and Mr. SMITH, who are part of the revolution, and they are going to be talking to us about the crime bill.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. I appreciate the very fine introduction of what this Congress is about from the gentleman from Ohio. I just wanted to add a remark or two to what you are saying about the popularity increase on the part of the Congress.

I tell you, we are all having trouble getting back to our districts because of the hectic pace that we are involved in. I heard today that we have already voted more than 100 votes in this month of January and the early part of February, and I think last year we reached that mark of 100 votes somewhere in May. So that is some indica-

tion to the viewers of the pace at which we are moving.

Mr. HOKE. The gentleman is completely correct. In fact, we are on track for doing more in the first 100 days of this Congress than has ever been achieved in the history of our Congress if we keep up at this rate. We had through the end of January been in session 115 hours. The average for the previous 10 Januarys was 28. We had had 79 votes on the floor up until then. The average had been 9.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I think, though, what is really important is as we talk to our two freshmen that are with us, is that this spirit of change really was affected by your election. It would not have happened. We would be continuing at the status quo of year after year everybody signs the balanced budget amendment, year after year everybody signs the line item veto, and a couple of these other hero bills, and you go back home and tell your Rotary Club, "I sponsored a bill, but doggone it, those rascals in Washington will not get it to the floor." The time for that kind of talk is over with, because of the huge new freshman class, and a freshman class who as candidates went out on a limb, most I think signed the Contract, but they said, "This is my agenda. If you elect me, this is what I am going to go for." And instead of throwing away that brochure on a election night, they are coming back day after day and reminding the voters what they said, instead of waiting for the voters to invite them.

With that, I think we owe them a lot of this credit, just to get the chance to vote. You may want to comment on, you know, what it is like. Because Mr. HOKE and I served under a previous regime, and it was not as fun and certainly it was not as vigorous as what we are doing now.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, I think what we have turned the American people into is C-SPAN junkies. I am having friends that didn't even have TV's who are getting up each morning so they can see what we did today. They got rid of the idea of Congress as a slow moving process, and they are saying, "We want to see what they did today." I think the freshmen came with the belief that we would do something everyday, but we did not realize when we got here that people would say, "Do you realize this is fast?" And when you look at what they used to do, we would not have barely got started. My understanding is it took way into February before we would actually even gear up very much.

Mr. HOKE. Generally speaking, we did not even come to Washington until the last week of January previously.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I was trying to do a summary of what we had done thus far, and I could not do a newsletter with enough in it, it would have had to have been so big. I said, you know, that is really something. I

said I was never coming to Congress. My polls were very high for the last 6 years, nearly 90 percent, I said I am not going because those guys are not doing anything. I am pretty glad to say not only are we doing something, but I am actually not sleeping more than 4 or 5 hours a night. It is pretty exciting. We came to a whole bunch of people ready to do action. We might be the steam, the freshmen, but there certainly was a train on its way. We are just pushing it along a little.

Mr. HOKE. We gave a great American a wonderful birthday present on Monday. Mr. KINGSTON, I wonder if I might ask you to talk a little bit about what that birthday present was, how it came about, and what it does for the American people.

Mr. KINGSTON. Of course, the great American you are speaking of is Ronald Reagan, and he was a man even before he was elected President who talked about the concept of the line-item veto. And the analogy that I have given my voters is just imagine if you are in a grocery store and you are buying your meat and potatoes, your fruit and your vegetables, and you are in the checkout line and the cashier says buy some caviar for me. You say I don't owe you any caviar. I don't eat caviar, it is too expensive. He says if you want your meat and potatoes, you have got to buy my caviar.

That sounds bizarre, but that is how the Congress has treated the American people, and the American presidents, for all these years. That anytime the President would go into an area like a flood disaster or something like that, we would always go in there and tack on our latest social program, our new little warm and fuzzy midnight basketball of the month or whatever it was. We say OK, we know you want to take care of the California earthquake victims, but in addition to this I want a little research money for the university back my way.

This gives the President the actual ability to take a pen and line item that out, that pork out of there, and say we do not need it anymore.

Mr. HOKE. Is that something that Governors have in most States or many States?

Mr. KINGSTON. Forty-three Governors have it. We have it in our State of Georgia. It has worked effectively. The Governor does not overuse it. But what it does is it puts him back in the process.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. That is something that amazed me when I got here. I was in the State Senate and the House and we always had a balanced budget amendment, and we had line-item veto. In fact, we not only had line-item veto for the budget, we had it for every bill, and the Governor could go in and take out pork and things that did not work. Now, sometimes we were a little irritated at the Governor, but the reality was it brought a great balance to some of us that might want to kick in a little pork for our district.

We had to think about a check and balance of the Governor. So I think that most States have something like this. For the Federal Government not to have it, seems a little ridiculous.

Mr. HOKE. Maybe one of the greatest reflections for the need for this is we seem to have an absolute inability to balance our budget. This is one more tool to try to get specifically to that. And Mr. KINGSTON, maybe you could illuminate this a little bit. It seems to me when we saw the people opposing it, were these the fiscal conservatives, the deficit hawks, the tightwads, or the big spenders in Congress?

Mr. KINGSTON. The people who opposed it generally used this philosophical argument that it tipped the balance of power. But what they were really saying is I want my pork. And I think we saw, for example, getting back to the earthquake, on the earthquake we sneaked into the budget or had sneaked in \$1.3 million for the Hawaiian sugar cane mills.

□ 2130

We have \$1.5 million to convert a nuclear power commercial ship into a museum, or \$10 million for a new train station in New York.

Mr. HOKE. Why is that not appropriate as a Federal expenditure?

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, there is certainly a philosophical question that these should probably not be things that the Federal Government is involved in. But more importantly than that, we have got people who have health care emergencies because of the earthquake, business emergencies, lives literally at stake. We need to get the money out to help the earthquake victims. We do not need to be sending it for train stations. The list goes on and on. But remember, it is every single appropriation bill has this little Christmas tree, what is in it for me, and if you want something in Ohio, then you are going to take care of me in Georgia. That is one reason why we have a national debt approaching \$5 trillion right now.

Mr. HOKE. And it got nearly 75 percent of the votes in this Congress. It had never previously been allowed to even come to the floor. Yet we got 301 votes.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. One of the things that we, a couple of things that we campaigned on heavily during our election process, were the line-item veto and the balanced budget amendment. And I used to say, after I had signed this Contract With America, one of the hidden pearls in this contract, not necessarily each and every item might be passed, but that we are calling forth from everyone that is in Congress a vote. We are making them vote up or down on each one of these issues. And if an item did not pass, then the people back in the district would understand that and how their Congressman voted. And they would have the opportunity next election to decide if they wanted to retain that Congressman.

But everywhere I went, the people back in west Tennessee felt that these two items, the line-item veto and the balanced budget amendment, were required because of the forced discipline. I have heard that term used an awful lot up here, but I am convinced that not only at the State level but at the Federal level, we need to force discipline by law. But we have to balance the budget.

The Chief Executive, the President, whoever, the Governor has a right to the line-item veto. And I think we have taken the correct steps. And once we got those bills out of the committee, up on the House floor for the first time probably, at least the line-item veto, I think maybe the balanced budget amendment was up a couple times, but we were forced, the Members, to vote and to show our cards. And I think that is why you saw the large amount of votes in support of each of these.

Mr. KINGSTON. One of the many votes on this was rejection of what I would call the light-item veto, l-i-g-h-t.

Mr. HOKE. Line-item veto light.

Mr. KINGSTON. That says that when the President does this, then it comes back to the Congress and we sit on it. And what he actually vetoed out does not take place, but we do not ever have to vote on it again. It is just the same old—

Mr. HOKE. That is pretty much the rescission package that we have got now.

Mr. KINGSTON. We rejected that. This package, what is so different about it, he sends it back to us. We have 20 days to say yes or no or to modify it or pass part of it or not, but if we do not take action, it is automatically in effect. So the ball is in our court.

It is not this, oh, well, we just kind of look the other way and pretend it does not count. The clock starts and we have got 20 days.

Mr. HOKE. I know it is a little technical, but I wonder if you could just share with me how the process works. We pass a bill. The Senate passes a bill, comes out of conference, goes to the President for a signature. What happens next?

Mr. KINGSTON. Let us just say it is an education bill, health care, welfare reform, and we stick in there, as are actual cases in years past, \$58 million for the American Shipbuilding Co. in Tampa, FL, \$11 million for a power-plant modernization for a naval shipyard that is about to be closed in Philadelphia. And we stick in another \$1 million for plant stress studies in Texas.

The President gets the health care bill. He says, wait, these three items, I do not like them. And so he circles them so to speak sends them back to Congress. He has got to do that within 10 days. He cannot just sit on it.

Mr. HOKE. He has 10 days to make those line items, to veto those particular lines.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is right. He sends it back, submits it to us. And incidentally, he can say, look, I do like the New York Yankees, and I am going to give them a little bit of sweetener for the shipyard down in Florida, and there is a relationship. So instead of giving them \$50 million, he decides to give them \$25 million. He does not even have to zap it out. He can just reduce it.

Then we get it back within 10 days. We have 20 days to vote on it. If we decide not to vote on it, it is law.

One other thing that is important to know, this is on spending, but if we pass a sweetheart tax deal and it only benefits less than 100 people or 100 or less specific corporations, just a clear conflict, because some powerful committee chairman says, look, I want you to take care of my little buddies over here, the President can also veto those out. People complain all the time about tax loopholes. This gives the President and, in this case, the Democrat President the chance to stand up to those.

Mr. HOKE. So let us say, for example, that some of our Democrat friends would put together a loophole to sweeten the pie for some of their fat-cat contributors with a tax loophole. If it is fewer than 100 people, the President can X that out and veto it. The thing that we do joke about Democrats, but you know, we did get into this situation from Democrats and Republicans. And the beauty of this that I like is that we have got a bipartisan Congress with Republican control passing a bill for a Democrat President. So we are giving him a very powerful tool to turn around and use, if he chooses to do so. I hope he will not be partisan about it and will be responsible.

I wanted to get a little bit to the balanced budget amendment, but I see we are running out of time here. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT], who is the former U.S. attorney from the western district of Tennessee, and, therefore has, I would say, a fair amount of expertise with respect to crime, to talk about the crime bill.

We passed two things today. One was habeas corpus reform and the other was exclusionary reform. I have to tell you that to most Americans who are not lawyers, of course, you and I are both on the Committee on the Judiciary. We are very much involved with all of this, but to most Americans who are not lawyers, the words "habeas corpus reform" mean absolutely nothing. Exclusionary rule reform means absolutely nothing.

What is going on here? Can you bring it down to earth for us?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Let me try to give a primer on this. As far as the exclusionary rule, that is a judicial court creation. It appears nowhere in the Constitution. We have heard that

bantered about in our arguments, that it violated the Constitution, what our forefathers wrote, those kinds of things. Actually, it is a rule that was crafted by the courts to in effect punish police officers for unlawful conduct. And over the years, there has been a constant balancing act between the rights of society as opposed to the rights of the criminal.

And over the past number of years, many of us feel that that pendulum has swung too far over in favor of the rights of the criminal and, in some cases, has actually resulted in the exclusionary rule being applied in trials that guilty people have gone free or, even before that, you recognized you have got a bad case because of this. You would have to plea bargain out or even dismiss a case.

Mr. HOKE. Where does this name "exclusionary rule" come from? What are we excluding?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Actually, it is excluding evidence from the trial. That is the remedy that the Court has foisted upon us. If it was deemed illegal evidence, then it is actually kept away from the jury.

A classic example is the ongoing trial in California and the issue of the glove that the police officer found at the home of Mr. Simpson. That was the subject of a lengthy suppression hearing to exclude that glove. And in that case, the judge did allow it into evidence.

But there is a great deal of confusion over the law in all these situations involving search warrants and even the warrantless searches. And I used to marvel, as a prosecutor, how, as in the case of Mr. Simpson in California and in other cases where you could spend hours and days, even longer periods of time, with law-school-trained prosecutors and defense counsel and judges arguing over the merits of this issue in a sanitized situation, a courtroom, with law clerks writing briefs and so forth for you.

□ 2140

Yet, on the other hand, we asked police officers, law enforcement officers who were in a tough situation out in the field, in less than sanitary conditions, often life-threatening situations, to make those kinds of decisions on the spot: "Do I seize this evidence or do I not seize this evidence?" Again, the lawyers and judges argue over these things for hours and days and cannot reach a conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, for too long I think we have not allowed for a reasonable mistake. Nobody expects perfection from our law enforcement, or from anything in our lives. I mentioned earlier to someone that Ken Griffey hits the ball safely 3 times out of 10 and he is a superstar in baseball.

Mr. HOKE. We certainly hope he will be hitting the ball 3 times out of 10 this summer.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. We hope, soon.

Mr. HOKE. What is it exactly we are talking about reforming here in this exclusionary rule?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. In this body we are talking about following what the courts are already beginning to do as the pendulum swings back toward a fair balance in protecting not only, again, not only the criminals' rights, but the victims' rights.

Mr. HOKE. We are talking about the Supreme Court, now?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. The Supreme Court. We are just expanding what they are doing to allow for this reasonable mistake on the part of the police officer in gathering evidence. If he makes a reasonable mistake in good faith, that is subject to the same exclusionary rule possibility, but a third party, a judge, provides an objective standard and decides whether that comes in or not. But again, it allows for a reasonable mistake and does not punish society by excluding or keeping away that evidence from the jury.

Mr. HOKE. Who has asked that this rule, that this change that has been made by the Supreme Court, actually be codified into Federal law? Who has been supporting this?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Of course, there has been a number of prosecutors, people involved in the legal system, but I would suspect both JACK and LINDA have seen demands from their constituents, as I did, that we ought to make some changes here in our judicial system and swing that balance back more toward society.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I just reverted into being a mom and a grandma, but I was a senator, too, and I think it seems worse to me than ridiculous rules, letting a rapist off, or letting someone that violently hurt someone off.

I think what we have done in this is common sense. That is the part about the Contract that I liked the most when I saw it, when I was first drafted as a write-in candidate in September. I saw this and I thought why would anybody not support this? It is common sense. That is one of those things that just came up as common sense to me.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I think one of the problems is that the American people just get so frustrated when we cannot get control of everything, and it seems that time after time, we are forgetting the victim, we are forgetting what is in the best interests of society, and we are going to the extreme to protect or defend some thug, and we are beating the law in his favor. As a result, we are not getting the convictions we need. These people are getting out. It is all a case of who can find the best technicality, and it does not really change the fact that this person may have committed murder, may have raped somebody,

may have kicked the door in and beat some people up.

That seems to be secondary to finding the technicality to getting them off. I am glad we are correcting this.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman well knows, on the Committee on the Judiciary we are not doing away with the exclusionary rule completely. There are still certain protections out there. The law enforcement, although they do not do this anymore, they may have done this back in 1914 when this was necessary to formulate this rule, but people do not beat folks in back rooms with rubber hoses to extract confessions anymore. However, if they did, certainly the exclusionary rule would still be available.

Mr. Speaker, what we are simply saying is that folks make mistakes. As long as they act in good faith, and a judge has to make that determination from an objective third party standpoint, that evidence ought to come in and not punish society because of a mistake. There are other avenues that that can be addressed in.

However, we did, once we came to the House floor, we had a good, healthy debate, but we had truly bipartisan support on this, and the bill passed, as I recall, overwhelmingly.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely correct. We had, I think, 300 votes or 298 votes, again 75 percent or 70 percent of the House voting in favor of it. Clearly, what we are seeing here is the pendulum swinging back, so that we can take back our streets, so that victims will have the rights that they need and that society will not become the victim of the criminal. If Members will look at the figures on this, fewer than 4 out of 100 crimes at this time, and I'm talking violent felonies, result in incarceration. Now, if the criminal justice system is going to act as a deterrent, then you have to do the time if you commit a crime. Otherwise it simply does not work as a deterrent. That is not the only purpose of the criminal justice system, but that certainly is an important one. For somebody contemplating criminal activity, they have to know that they are going to get caught, that when they are caught they are going to be convicted, and when they are convicted they are going to be incarcerated. They are going to be confined.

Mr. Speaker, let me move, if I could, from the exclusionary rule issue to this thing called habeas corpus. Now, habeas corpus, what on Earth does it mean? What are we doing? What is going on?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Literally, "habeas corpus" means "you have the body." It started out in the 1800s, as I remember reading, where people who were wrongfully convicted, or even perhaps kept in jail without a trial, used that as a mechanism to have a hearing to get out of jail.

What has developed over the years, though, has been a system of, I believe,

abuse by people in the jail who filed habeas corpus petition after petition over a period of years, with the net effect of being able to, particularly in death penalty cases, to delay the implementation of their death sentence effectively.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I am confused. Does that mean they just appeal over and over again, based on what statute? How do they do that? "You have got the body." You have me confused. Try that again.

Mr. KINGSTON. Tom, she does not mean you have the body.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Remember, we are not all attorneys. I didn't quite understand that.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. There are at least three avenues that people sentenced to the death penalty can travel. Of course, they have their natural State appeals. Then there is a habeas corpus procedure within the State, and then the Federal habeas corpus procedure.

People that are on death row and their attorneys are experts at maximizing these appeals, and in many cases, going back, and not necessarily appealing the same issues, but raising new issues each time to delay, as we all know, and we heard so often on the campaign trail from our constituents, delaying it 15, 20 years or more. That was probably, again, one of the major complaints that I heard.

As I look there on the Contract that you are checking off, on Number 2, we are getting very close, because today not only did we work on the exclusionary rule, and yesterday on victims' compensation, but we did pass this fairly severe modification, changes to the habeas corpus proceedings.

The two things I talked about were limiting the numbers of these appeals and the timeliness of them, and we did exactly that today.

Mr. HOKE. Can you flesh that out a little for us, ED? How much time does somebody have now, after they have been convicted of a capital crime, and I mean convicted through the entire appellate process, so I think people should understand that we are not talking about—habeas corpus does not begin upon conviction at trial.

You are convicted at the trial level, and then typically there is an appeal to the first appellate level, and then there is another appeal to the second appellate level, which would probably be the State Supreme Court. Am I correct on that?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. As there should be.

Mr. HOKE. As there should be, absolutely.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Like any trial, they are entitled to fair appeal decisions.

Mr. HOKE. Then there is a final order of the highest court in that particular State?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. That is correct. Then they usually begin the habeas corpus process.

Mr. HOKE. At that point they have already had two appeals process. This is not from the trial court, this is already after a final adjudication from the highest court in that particular State?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. That is right. Generally under the law that we passed today, if it is a State appeal, a State conviction they are appealing from, they have 1 year in which to file their habeas corpus petition. If it is a Federal appeal in which they are applying for habeas corpus, then they have 2 years.

It is on a faster track now, and I think as this bill works its way over, up the process, I think you are going to see some improvement.

Mr. HOKE. Right, it is on a faster track, but just so we get a real idea, a faster track, for a U.S. attorney to say that, it may seem like a faster track to you, but I don't know if it seems like a very fast track to the public.

If you are talking about the trial, the trial could take 3 to 6 to 12 months, even, but let's say it just takes 6 months, and then how long would the first appellate procedure usually take?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Of course, that depends on the States. But I think you are looking, as opposed to the 10 to 15 years that are probably average today, you are looking at a much shorter period of time. If you could keep it under 5 years and work down from that, I think that is a fairly fast track for this type of case.

Mr. HOKE. Who is paying for the attorney's fees for the capital inmates at this point?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Probably 100 percent of them are being paid by taxpayers at either State expense, or certainly at Federal expense.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT], how much are we paying for these guys to stay in jail? I have noticed on my tours, they all have air conditioning, they all have television, they all have weight-lifting rooms and gymnasiums, and they are not required to work, so they get to watch TV. What does that cost?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. You all know, literally it costs millions and millions of dollars.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. In our State, over \$30,000 a year.

Mr. KINGSTON. \$30,000 to \$50,000 per year per prisoner.

□ 2150

While some wealthy law firm is going around with endless appeals, not worrying about the victim, not worrying about the detriment to society and just having a good time at it.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. They are usually specific lawyer capital resources centers that are publicly funded that are the experts from the defense standpoint and are able to use the system of appeal that we have just

talked about in an effort to get a new trial, but also, concurrent with that, to delay the execution of cases.

So again, it is a hot button item. I think what we did do today, I want to commend our leadership, and all of those people who voted for this bill. It is a major step toward alleviating this type of problem and complaint.

Mr. HOKE. The gentleman from Tennessee has worked as a U.S. attorney. That is a big responsibility. I assume the gentleman has prosecuted capital cases.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. I have not, but I have certainly been around those who have.

Mr. HOKE. Are we effectively tightening up the habeas corpus process in a way that will shorten the time frame? Are we doing anything in this process to in any way undermine the rights of defendants in this process? Do they still have the ability to make these appeals in a timely and effective way?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. That is a concern. It is probably not a popular one to talk about on the campaign trail, but you have to look at it from the standpoint too of the person who is charged. And of course, by this point they have been convicted, they have had due process of law, they have had a full, good attorney, full-blown trials and they have had appeals. But they still have certain rights, especially when we are talking about the ultimate penalty, the death penalty.

But as we talked before, this bill that we passed today I think brings the pendulum back, the balance back into the system, particularly in capital cases, particularly in the time and economics of it and the actual deterrence of it. That is something that is very frequently talked about, that really the death penalty is not a deterrent. I do believe it is a deterrent, but to be an even better deterrent it has to be done like any punishment, swiftly. Those are the two things, it has to be certain punishment and swift punishment to be an effective deterrent. We have lost that in our society, particularly with the death penalty, and I think once we get this process going and up to speed, as it should be, while protecting the rights of the defendant, which I think it does, I think we will have an effective deterrent.

Mr. HOKE. I think that is important to emphasize, that defendants' rights are clearly being protected, but at the same time society's rights to have a timely resolution, a final resolution, an execution of its will, of society's will, the carrying out of its will, that that will be possible now with this habeas reform.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. We are not talking about everybody that is convicted of a crime that has to do this, but you know I always talked about on the campaign trail that we had I believe about 300 people on death row in Tennessee. And I told everybody if they could go back and look at each

one of those individual cases and the underlying facts of the case, you know, each one of those is a death penalty case and when you read about it in the newspaper, it just hits you in the stomach, what an atrocious, horrible, heinous crime it is. These are the types of cases we are talking about, not just everything that comes along.

Mr. HOKE. We are talking about the tremendous frustration that society feels as a whole, that the community feels and that victims' families feel with the inability of our justice system to actually come to final resolution in these things, and the anger that is the result of that. So that this thing continues to turn and turn and turn and go on and on. I am glad the gentleman clarified that. I very much appreciate it.

I learned something tonight about the gentlewoman from Washington. I did not know that she only decided to get involved in a race for the U.S. Congress in September, literally 2 months before the election, or it must have been an even shorter time, 6 weeks. How long?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Nine weeks.

Mr. HOKE. The gentlewoman is not exactly a newcomer to politics.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Do I understand that the gentlewoman won by a write-in?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I went away for a weekend and came back after Labor Day, and there was a write-in going on, and 2 weeks later I was the person on the ballot with the most votes. But they were write-in votes.

Mr. KINGSTON. I would like to register a protest. That is a little unfair. The rest of us started 2 years, and the gentlewoman just 2 months. I am sure she blitzed it.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. You know, it is women, they are just more efficient.

Mr. KINGSTON. I will yield the floor then.

Mr. HOKE. The gentlewoman is not exactly a newcomer to politics. But to jump into this with 9 weeks, I wish I had only 9 weeks. That is fantastic.

What was it that motivated the gentlewoman to want to be a part of this, to get involved with the U.S. Congress? We had talked earlier and the gentlewoman said something about welfare. What are your feelings there?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. First of all, when I first went in office in the early 1980s in the State, what happened was I saw people go on welfare as our State doubled for my business, I ran a corporation, doubled the taxes in 1 year. And I laid people off, and I saw people go on to welfare who used to work for me as secretaries and receptionists, at the entry level mostly, mostly women, and it got my attention that government could put people out of work.

So the point on the contract that I have been focusing on is the item of welfare and job creation. You know,

the best welfare is a job. I cannot think of any family, any single mom, any family of any kind that would not just as soon take care of themselves. Welfare is where we do not want to be, or we want to get off.

So when I looked at the contract I saw that they did several things in the contract that I liked. I saw capital gains. I used to teach tax law changes and I saw people not sell because if they sold they lost everything in taxes, and it tied up their money, and it tied up their jobs. And so I looked at the capital gains portion of the contract which we are coming up against and I saw it as jobs. If that money is released, I had money to hire people.

Then I looked at the small business section.

Mr. HOKE. Could I ask the gentlewoman a question about the capital gains thing, because our friends from the other side of the aisle, as soon as they hear the words capital gains, the accusation is oh, that is for rich people, that is just something that is designed to help them pay lower taxes. Is that what is going on? Who gets, who gains the most from reductions in capital gains?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. The people I saw were the people I did the tax returns for, and I had about 400 clients as well as the company I ran, and most of them were small business owners. They were families that were investing in property or equipment or whatever. And they would benefit or they would lose everything. And what I would see is when we had a high capital gains tax they would hold on, and they would not sell, and they would not buy new equipment, and they might not upgrade, they might not do anything with their business to grow, and they would not create jobs. If we had a reasonable capital gains they would turn over equipment, they would buy, they would hire more people, and they would grow. And I did tax returns for 15 years and worked with small businesses and corporations and it never changed. I did not work with the big guys. I worked with the people that provide in my State 80 percent of the jobs, and that was small business.

Mr. HOKE. In Germany there is no capital gains tax. In Japan there is a capital gains tax of 5 percent, which I understand from accountants gets zeroed out with some exemptions, so there is effectively a zero capital gains tax.

It is by creating more jobs, by having that money that would have been locked in because people are afraid to sell, they are reluctant to sell because of high taxes, that money getting recycled through the economy in a way that creates more commerce, creates more enterprise, creates more jobs, that is the bottom line of reducing the capital gains tax, is it not?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Yes. And you know what was really something, was for years I sat there running a corporation and not realizing until one

day when they doubled my tax, and the Federal Government messed around with the capital gains again and raised it that it was affecting me, and I connected it to jobs like that. And I think what is happening around the Nation, and why November was so significant is small business people all over the Nation really spoke. I really believe that. I know in my district I was a write-in candidate, and in 2 weeks the people, nearly 40,000 came together and wrote in my name.

That was fueled by entrepreneurs. It was not fueled by a Boeing or Weyerhaeuser, and these people know that they had better change the policy-makers here. And when you look at this contract I think it gave them hope.

□ 2200

I see it as a key ingredient to us producing jobs.

Mr. KINGSTON. There is another angle to this, too. In my area, for example, Bulloch County, GA, Statesboro, GA, Georgia Southern University has a lot of growth. There are a lot of ladies who are widows now but they live on a family farm which is in a growth area. The city is sprawling, and they want to sell that property. They have owned it for 30 years. They may have bought it for \$10,000. Now it is worth a half-a-million dollars. But they are in their seventies or eighties. They cannot farm it. They have trouble getting somebody to lease it out. They want to sell it. Their fixed income on Social Security and whatever benefits may be \$12,000 or \$15,000, but if they sell that farm, then all of a sudden they are in the highest tax bracket.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Worse than that, they have the inheritance tax in some cases, depending on when their spouse dies.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is right.

Mr. HOKE. Let me ask you a question, if I could, I say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON]. What is that tax on from \$10,000 to a half-a-million dollars, is that on what is really being taxed there with this capital gains tax?

Mr. KINGSTON. It is not the tax of the income but the 500,000 sales value is treated like income for that year. For that year she might as well be a stockbroker on Wall Street.

Mr. HOKE. She is being taxed on inflation, is she not? Is that not really what is being taxed?

Mr. KINGSTON. That is right. Also what we are doing is we are making her dependent, because she may want to sell that farm so she can go into a long-term care home. We are saying you cannot do that. She wants to be independent. That is why she held onto the property, and now we are denying her that option.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. You know, what you have also led to is another part of the contract. We deal

with inheritance tax reform in the contract, and I would like to go even further, whether it is a small business person, usually it is, or the tree farmer in my area. They are having to actually sell their small businesses to pay the inheritance tax. By the time they get done, they can pay nearly 70-some percent in taxes, and they literally are often cash poor. In our area now they are mowing down trees on these family farms. We grow trees in Washington. They have to cut them down prematurely so they can pay inheritance tax to barely hold onto the property. That is pitiful.

In the contract we say middle America should not have to give away the farm to the Government. It is unfair. They have paid taxes on that. It goes to their families. It should not be lost to Government.

And so this contract has a great amount of compassion for middle-class America in it, and that is what made it attractive to me as a candidate to be able to talk about it, and now as a policymaker, it is in my mind a gift we can give to the American people that we will be able to be proud of for many years to come.

Mr. HOKE. Did I understand that you, as a freshman Member of this Congress, are chairing a subcommittee in the Small Business Committee?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Yes. I think it is fantastic, because my background is taxation and finance for small business. You know, that was my life before this. I ran a tax preparation business and a management business and was a licensed tax consultant, so it fits well, and that is what is wonderful about this contract.

Mr. HOKE. What else do we have in the Contract With America that is designed specifically, aimed at job creation?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Regulation, regulation reform. You take a look at it.

Mr. HOKE. You want to regulate more?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. No. We need to regulate right. When a regulation is needed, it is needed, and sometimes we have to say there needs to be some rules, but the reality is the Federal Government is regulating where it is not necessary. So we put some accountability into this for businesses and communities.

A lot of the regulation is raising people's water bills, and so by the time we get done making it more job friendly, we are also making it more friendly to the families that are trying to get jobs.

I do not see business as anything more than a job creator, and this contract has a section that says we are going to create jobs, and that is our best welfare system.

Mr. HOKE. You know, what I hear in everything that is being said tonight is that it sounds to me like we have got a pendulum that has been way out here, and it is moving back. It is moving back in a lot of different ways. It is

moving back with respect to reform of our criminal justice system so that the victim gets an even break instead of just the criminal. It sounds like we are moving back toward the center in our way of regulating enterprise so that the enterprise gets a break, the farmer gets a break, the person that is creating jobs so that he or she can create more jobs, is getting a break, and we are swinging back that way.

And it sounds like with respect to the regulation of Government itself, we are giving tools in this case to our executive branch with the line-item veto, to the Congress itself with respect to the balanced budget amendment. So there can be some fiscal sanity, some basic common sense in the way we spend the taxpayers' money.

And it seems to me that this is a theme that we have seen in terms of what the American people want repeated over and over and over again, and I believe that is why they gave us the honor of having a majority, and it is our job, it is our job to keep the promises that we made to the American people and to fulfill them in a way that gives them confidence in our ability to govern and to bring about the kind of commonsense legislation in governing that they expect, demand, and deserve.

I happen to see the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], my good friend. It looks like you wanted to say something.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do not want to take a whole bunch of time. We are marking up an education bill tomorrow which is part of the contract. We are not talking too much about that; also the defense side. But we have got the freshmen represented here. Most of them we campaigned for. We have got sophomores.

I just wanted to let you know how proud that we are that for 4 years, many of us sat here on the House floor and were rolled over day after day. The Committee on Rules determined every piece of legislation that came to the floor.

In 20 years, the Republicans only had one motion to recommit passed. The King-of-the-Hill rules, we never won a single one, and for the first time, I heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] bring it up, that there are many of the Members on the other side of the aisle that really want to work and do the people's business, but the leadership, the liberal leadership, in the past has prevented that either from twisting arms or preventing it by the rules on the House floor, and I think we are seeing by the numbers of these votes that we can do these things in a very bipartisan way in which the American people are asking.

You look at 290 votes or 300 votes on an amendment or against an amendment, that I think that shows bipartisanship, and I think that it shows people that this House can work, and after the contract is over in 100 days, I hope we can continue to do the same thing.

I just wanted to thank you. I am over there working on this markup for tomorrow. I want to thank all of you.

Mr. HOKE. Thank you very much.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the distinguished fighter pilot and American hero will yield, what we feel so good about, I think being sophomores, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] and I am, to be on the team with the freshmen, but really to follow in the footsteps of people like you who have been out fighting the battle, yet we seem to add more and more who are concerned about the future of America.

You know, none of us are really career politicians. We are going to try to do this. We are going to try to get the contract passed. We are going to try to change America, but we can also go back home if somebody better can do it, if somebody can do a better job, and you know, we are not up here so that we are going to be here for 30 or 40 years and build our own little empires, and Representatives like you who have helped us along the way have made it possible, I think, for the changes that are taking place to occur.

Mr. HOKE. My hat is absolutely off to every senior Republican Member in this Congress. I am amazed; I mean it, I know what it was like the last 2 years. Never having been in a legislative body before, I know what it is like just getting beat up every day and losing and feeling, frankly, not very proud of that work that is being done in this body, and the difference to have something that we feel we ourselves can feel proud of, of what we are doing, and we hope, we hope to goodness that the American people feel proud of what we are doing.

My indications from what I understand and from my constituents, and if you look at this poll, doubling the approval rating of Congress, I mean, where they are feeling confidence once more.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is Republicans and Democrats, the approval of Congress, what we are doing.

Mr. HOKE. Is bipartisan. As you point out, I said it earlier, we have strong, strong bipartisan support on every single measure we passed. You remember, what was the toughest victory for the Democrats in 1993?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The tax package.

Mr. HOKE. The tax package. In August 1993, one vote here, one vote in the Senate. It took the Vice President of the United States to break that vote. That is because Democrats voted against it. The only reason they finally passed it was because they could not abandon their President who then at that point had only been in office for about 8 months.

What have we seen on this package? We have seen a very positive bipartisan cooperative effort notwithstanding the kind of ugly partisanship that you see from time to time on the floor.

The fact is, look at these numbers, and you will see that we have had tremendous bipartisan support on every

single one of these bills. This is Americans thinking of not being Republicans first or Democrats first but being Americans first and doing what is best for America. I am excited. I am proud to be a part of it. I really am proud to be a part of it. I cannot say that I was proud to be a part of the 103d Congress. I made no bones about it. I let my constituents know that as well.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. You should be proud of what you are doing, but being held down and getting beaten down every day makes it kind of tough.

Mr. HOKE. I wonder if I could ask the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentlewoman from Washington and the gentleman from Georgia if there are any final thoughts you wanted to share?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Well, I had mentioned in my first remarks that I had not had a chance to be home that much because of this hectic pace here. I have gone home every weekend though for short periods of time, and this Contract With America is great. People are still talking about it. They know what are doing up here. They are pleased with what we are doing. They know we are making progress, and what I tell them is that we are in essence simply doing what we said we would do.

□ 2210

Now I got to admit that is unusual for somebody in politics to do that, but that is our motto, we are actually doing what we said we would do. We are holding ourselves out as responsible, as accountable, to the American public.

We put it down in writing. It was published in TV Guide. People out there know what it is, and I am pleased to stand up and say, "Yes, hold us accountable, make us do what we said we would do, make us bring these bills up onto the floor, have a full and open debate, which we are having," and again, as I say, the hidden peril in this is make us all vote up or down on those, and, if you don't like the way we voted on it, then you can bring us home the next time you have a chance, in 2 years.

So, I, too, am pleased to be with all of you. I cannot imagine what it is like to toil in the trench like you have. We are spoiled, and I would not have it any other way.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. As my colleagues know, I think he started something that makes me think about the word I used so much in the campaign, short as it was, and that was the word commitment. I was actually—I came home from vacation after 3 days of vacation, and people wanted me to run, and so they did a write-in, and I said,

I tell you what I'll commit to do: the same thing I've always done, and that's smaller government. I'm going to say no a lot, and I'm going to keep my commitments to you as I always have.

Well, that is the word this contract represents to me, and that is keeping

my commitment to the American people. People really like that. They do not seem to expect me to dot every i and cross every t, but they want us to try very hard to keep our commitments.

While I have been here a month, and I did serve in the Senate in Washington State for several years, so I have some experience, I have never had the experience of people working so hard to keep their word to the American people. Because I think we all know that in November people said, "Go do what you said, and, if you don't, we're going to get some others."

We know that, but we also are driven by the fact that we understand we are servants, we are messengers from the people, and I think most of us understand it, and I got here in a whole bunch of people that have been here before me, and they were just ready to deliver that message, too.

The freshmen have been the steam, again, but the train was going down the track, and we were able to jump on and be a part, and we have not been excluded. I am not LINDA SMITH, a freshman here. I am LINDA SMITH, an integral part of a complete change that is going to be written in history as a turning point of America.

Mr. HOKE. What do you think, Mr. KINGSTON?

Mr. KINGSTON. I say this, Mr. HOKE and Mr. CUNNINGHAM, we heard Mr. BRYANT and Mrs. SMITH talk tonight. As she said many times, they are the team. I would say they are also the fuel and a little more volatile than steam in many respects.

The changes are real though. We are not turning back. America is going to change, I hope, because Congress has changed. We have left the foxhole. We are advancing. We are going to take the hill or we are going to get shot, and that is still up to the American people, but we cannot turn back at this point.

I will caution this:

There is talk, the Senate today. I understand that the balanced budget amendment might not pass. They are against the line-item veto. We are going to be passing a spending cut bill which the Senate has already said they are not going to do.

So I would say to people, let's keep this revolution going, the revolution is alive and well in the House. Let's wake up the folks over in the other body by phone calls and letters. But we're going to keep moving, and I'm proud to be with you, and I'm proud to be serving with people like Mr. BRYANT and Mrs. SMITH.

Mr. HOKE. Well, we are going to keep moving, and I think it is important, and you are absolutely right. We ought to encourage our constituents to do that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, do you want to add anything?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would like to say one thing:

I see my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr.

OWENS], here, and even though in many of the economic issues we disagree, I want to point out something, that on the floor, when the leadership of his party was blasting Christians, two of the Members of the Black Caucus came up to me, MAJOR, and they grabbed me by the arm and said, "DUKE, don't you ever lose your Judeo-Christian values," and they stick tight, and they believe in those values, and I would like to thank my friend, Mr. OWENS.

Mr. HOKE. Thank you very much. Thanks for participating. I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] and the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] for their participation tonight. This is great, to be able to share with each other our thoughts on these things and to keep track because I think the fact is that we are right on track, we are right on target. We are using this as a roadmap to stay the course and to do exactly what we said we would do.

We said it before, we will say it again, and you know how true it is in terms of how hard we are working, but we are working hard to keep the promises that we have made for real changes. We are going to continue to do that.

It certainly makes for long days, and it is making for some rings under people's eyes, but it is very exciting.

I appreciate your input, and I appreciate your sharing this special order with me tonight.

WILL WE BE BETTER OFF WHEN THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA HAS BEEN PASSED?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, jobs, the No. 1 concern of the overwhelming majority of Americans. Jobs are the No. 1 concern of the people, but you do not see that same concern reflected here in Washington around the floor of this House. The question that most Americans are asking is will we be better off when the 100 days are ended and the Contract With America has been passed. Does it matter one way or the other with respect to our concern about jobs and income? Will we be better off, those who have lost wages over the last 10 years? They have jobs, but the jobs are not paying as much as they paid before. So, will they have higher paid jobs after the Contract With America is passed? Will they be better off?

No.

There is a tremendous amount of downsizing that is taking place. Corporations are maximizing their profits. Profits are escalating, getting greater